

Remarks

Claims 1-18 are pending in the present application, and claims 1-18 were rejected in the Final Office Action dated November 23, 2004. With this Amendment, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 10.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims

Claims 1-3, 8-12 and 17-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,055,998). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Wright et al. does not teach or suggest “converting further compris[ing] evaluating one or more formulas while converting said spreadsheet file to said second format” as recited, for example, in amended claim 1. Amended claim 1 requires evaluating one or more formulas while converting the spreadsheet file. Wright et al., does not teach or suggest evaluating one or more formulas while converting, *e.g.*, evaluating formulas as part of the conversion process. The portion of Wright et al. cited with respect to claim 1 states “[w]hen an expression 1511 is entered into the display of cell 1503, the spreadsheet program immediately computes the expression's value and displays the value in the cell 1503. . . . Similarly, when a user changes the value of a cell 1503 whose value is used to compute the values of other cells, the spreadsheet program immediately recomputes all of the other values. When a user is finished working on a spreadsheet, the spreadsheet program saves the representation of the spreadsheet in non volatile storage such as a disk drive.” (Col. 20, ll., 22-37; emphasis added). The cited portion of Wright et al. merely discusses computing a value of a cell in a spreadsheet. There is no “converting” discussed in the portion of Wright et al. and no “evaluating one or more formulas while converting.” Claim 1 recites, for example, “converting said spreadsheet file to a second format wherein said converting further comprises evaluating one or more formulas while converting said spreadsheet file to said second format.” (Emphasis added.)

Furthermore, the end of the cited portion of Wright et al. confirms that there is no converting involved, stating that the spreadsheet representation is simply saved "in non volatile storage such as a disk drive."

The rejection to claim 8 is respectfully traversed for similar reasons. The cited portions of Wright et al. do not teach or suggest converting comprising compiling code that is readable by a small device.

Claim 10 is not unpatentable over Wright et al. for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is not unpatentable over Wright et al. Claims 2-3, 8-9 and 11-12, 16-17 depend upon claims 1 and 10 respectively and are also therefore not unpatentable.

Claims 4-7 and 13-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright et al. in view of Pajokowski et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,718,425). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection to the claims. Claims 4-7 and 13-16 depend from claims 1 and 10 respectively and therefore are not unpatentable for at least the same reasons.

II. Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, Applicants submit that all claims are allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 25, 2005

By: 

Michael C. Martensen
Registration No. 46,901

Customer No.: 26263
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
Phone: 202/ 408-9214
Fax: 312/ 876-7457